Dear Paul,

7/17/80

I've not been able to keep reading the Summers outrage against decency because of work pressures, but when I tired a short while ago I continued to the end of the chapter that includes his treatment of the Nosenko story.

His attitude and preconceptions do not surprise me because they were telegraphed by more than his uncritical retailing of Epstein - his covering up for the Epsteinker.

A more dishonest treatment of the Nosenko matter and the Hart testimony is impossible to imagine.

Where did you park your critical faculties while you read his ms?

The more one gets into the book the less ~~[illegible]~~ unhidden is his literary theivery and his technique for covering it. That you appear not to have detected this is either no credit to your perception or to any principles. I'm really surprised.

More so because just about all of us should have understood long before this that no good comes from irresponsible or dishonest work. Particularly not criticism of the official line that is of these ~~[illegible]~~ characters.

I'm really terribly disappointed.

It is not only because this stuff is straight Angleton/Epsteiner line.

There is a simple touchstone . Read his account of how Nosenko was treated as a "prisoner of war" and compare that with the actualities of Nosenko's treatment.

Or with the manner in which prisoners of war are treated in even his account, rotten and dishonest as it is.

All of this and all else like it at there best do all we have tried so hard to do great harm.

While the book is immeasurably worse that his public appearance, they are more than bad and then reach many more people

If you can suggest any good that can come from all of this I'd be interested.

I'm disappointed,